

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application as currently amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-13 and 17 are currently pending in the application. Claims 9-13 have been amended to depend from independent Claim 17. Claims 14-16 have been canceled and have been replaced by new Claim 17. Support for Claim 17 can be found on at least page 10, lines 8-25 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

By way of summary, Claims 9-12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goesele et al. (US 6,150,239, hereinafter “Goesele”) in view of Usenko (US 6,995,075). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Goesele and in view of Usenko and further in view of Maleville et al. (US 6,403,450, hereinafter “Maleville”).

Turning to the rejection of Claims 9-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goesele in view of Usenko, the Official Action (page 3) takes the position that Goesele does not disclose a step of thinning down the thin film transferred onto a target substrate. To overcome this deficiency in Goesele, the Official Action (page 3) turns to Usenko for this feature. In addition, the Official Action (page 3) states that while Goesele does “not use the same verbiage regarding the determination of the acceptor defects, in order that the number of accepted defects is compatible with the desired electrical properties of the thin film, this [sic, that the determination of acceptor defects] constitutes routine optimization of process parameters to achieve a result.”

New Claim 17 specifies that the initial substrate is made of SiC and that the implantation conditions allow the obtaining of a defect concentration in the first 500 nm of implanted SiC which is lower than 9.10^{20} atoms/cm³. These conditions obtain in the thin film layer, thinned to a thickness lower than 500 nm, an acceptable number of defects. According

to the invention, keeping the defect concentration under a threshold along a required thickness of implanted SiC obtains a transferred thin film presenting required electrical properties.

Neither Goesele nor Usenko suggest the precise threshold as recited in Applicants' claims. Consequently, neither Goesele nor Usenko disclose the precise threshold in association with a thinning step of the initial substrate. Accordingly, Applicants believe that Claim 17, as currently amended, is not taught or suggested by the combined teachings and suggestions of Goesele and Usenko.

Turning next to the rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Goesele in view of Usenko and Maleville, this rejection should be withdrawn because there is nothing in the Official Action to indicate that Maleville would overcome the basic deficiencies of the basic combination to Goesele and Usenko and because Claim 13 depends from Claim 17.

From all of the above, Claims 9-13 and 17 are considered to be in condition for allowance. An early indication to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Registration No. 40,073
Attorney of Record

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Stuart S. Levy
Registration No. 61,474